

## Remarks

### Status of the Claims

Claims 1-42 are pending.

### Issues Raised in the Outstanding Office Action

The outstanding Office Action raises three issues, discussed in turn, below:

#### (1) Claim Objections

Although there is some inconsistency in the claim objections, the Examiner is seeking comments as to the objection in paragraph 1 of the Office Action mailed June 28, 2005 (the objection of paragraph 16 indicates that but for their dependency, claims 4-9, and 17 are allowable).

Initially, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection is improper. According to MPEP § 608.01, the form paragraph used by the examiner is used to “point out minor informalities such as spelling errors, inconsistent terminology, etc., which should be corrected.”

Applicants respectfully submit that objecting to the use of American Society for Testing and Materials procedures is not within the purview of “objectionable material.” Additionally, the record sets forth no evidence that the use of ASTM standards in claim language is improper. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand the subject matter of the subject claims with clarity and precision. The ASTM is the world’s largest source of voluntary consensus standards, and operates more than 125 main technical committees that function in prescribed fields under

regulations that ensure balanced representation among users. According to the USPTO database, “ASTM” has been used in claim language over 4,000 times.

Nonetheless, the above amendment to the claims should address the Examiner’s concerns by further describing the standard.

Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

(2) Distinct Reasons for the Allowance of Claim 1

In the amendment of November 28, 2005, the feature of an uni-directional pressure relief valve was added to claim 1. The WO ‘217 reference fails to disclose or suggest an uni-directional pressure relief valve.

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 10-16, and 18-25 should be allowable.

(3) Independent Claims 33 and 42 addressed with respect to the Applied Reference

As stated in the Amendment of November 28, 2005, claim 33 is a combination of claims 1 and original claim 17. Paragraph 16 of the office action indicated that claim 17 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Accordingly, claim 33 and claims dependent therefrom should be allowable.

Claim 42 clearly incorporated an uni-directional pressure relief valve. Like the other claims discussed herein and in the previous amendment, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest an uni-directional pressure relief valve.

From the foregoing, Applicant's respectfully submit that allowance of the application is proper, and such action is earnestly solicited.

No fee is required for the Response. Should a fee be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with the filing of this application to Deposit Account 50-2752.

Finally, please contact the undersigned if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general.

Additionally, as previously offered, should the Examiner believe that an interview will remove issues precluding allowance, Applicants representative will be happy to arrange one at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard S. Myers, Jr.  
Registration No. 42,022  
STITES & HARBISON, PLLC  
424 Church Street, Suite 1800  
Nashville, TN 37219  
(615) 244-5200  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT